

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MICHAEL A. VIDAL, et al.,

Case No.: 2:22-cv-00274-ART-BNW

Plaintiffs,

V.

VERIZON PENSION PLAN FOR
ASSOCIATES, et al.,

Defendants

**ORDER APROVING
STIPULATION FOR EXTENSION OF
TIME FOR MICHAEL A. VIDAL AND
ESTATE OF EVA RAMOS (THROUGH
ITS ADMINISTRATOR JESSICA
CLEMENTE) TO FILE AN
OPPOSITION AND RESPONSE TO ECF
NO. 42 (THE DEFENDANTS' MOTION
TO DISMISS) WHICH SUBJECT
MOTION WAS FILED ON JUNE 17, 2022**

(FIRST REQUEST)

Now come Plaintiffs Michael A. Vidal and Estate of Eva Ramos (through its Administrator Jessica Clemente) (hereinafter collectively “Plaintiffs”), Conduent Incorporated, Conduent Business Services, LLC, Xerox Corporation, and Xerox HR Solutions, LLC (hereinafter collectively the “Conduent Defendants”), and Defendants Verizon Pension Plan for Associates, Verizon Employee Benefits Committee, Kevin Cammarata, Verizon California Inc., Verizon Communications Inc., Verizon Services Corp., and Verizon North. LLC, (hereinafter collectively the “Verizon Defendants”), and pursuant to LR IA 6-1, LR IA 6-2, LR 7-1, LR 7-2, Federal Rule of Civil

1 Procedure Rule 6 and any other applicable rule needed to effectuate this stipulation hereby stipulate
2 and agree concerning the above captioned case (Case No. 2:20-cv-00924-ART-BNW (hereinafter
3 referred to as the “Case” or “instant matter”)) as follows:

4 WHEREAS, as the *all* parties that have appeared in the Case (including Conduent
5 Defendants, Verizon Defendants and the Plaintiffs (hereinafter the Conduent Defendants, Verizon
6 Defendants and Plaintiffs are collectively referred to as the “Stipulating Parties”)) agreed, consented
7 and stipulated between themselves to the stipulations, agreements, caveats, terms and conditions
8 presented and embodied in a preceding stipulation (ECF No. 32) filed by the Conduent Defendants
9 on June 6, 2022 (hereinafter ECF No. 32 is referred to as the “June 6th SAO”)(the June 6th SAO is
10 incorporated herein by reference).

11 WHEREAS, Stipulating Parties agreed, consented and stipulated to all stipulations,
12 agreements, caveats, terms and conditions submitted to the Court in the June 6th SAO and whereas
13 the aforesaid stipulations, agreements, caveats, terms and conditions where agreed and stipulated
14 to—by the Stipulating Parties—in both the June 6th SAO (on the record) and emails (off the record)
15 and whereas the June 6th SAO was a quid pro quo stipulation made in good faith and not made for
16 purposes of delay (and based on the June 6th SAO the Conduent Defendants and Verizon Defendants
17 were permitted by the Court to file their first responses in this Case within the extended stipulated
18 period provided under the June 6th SAO (which each did on June 17, 2022)).

19 WHEREAS, the Verizon Defendants filed a motion to dismiss (ECF No. 42) (hereinafter
20 referred to as the “Verizon MTD”) on June 17, 2022 and in the Verizon MTD the Verizon
21 Defendants also stated they “join” the Conduent Defendants’ subsequent June 17, 2022 motion to
22 dismiss (ECF No. 44).

23 WHEREAS, the Conduent Defendants also filed a motion to dismiss (ECF No. 44)
24 (hereinafter referred to as the “Conduent MTD”) on June 17, 2022 and in the Conduent MTD the
25 Conduent Defendants also state they “join” the Verizon MTD (ECF No. 42).

26 WHEREAS, the Court has set July 1, 2022 as the last date that the Plaintiffs can file
27 responses and oppositions to the Verizon MTD. (ECF. No. 42).

28 WHEREAS, the Court has also set July 1, 2022 as the last date that the Plaintiffs’ can file

1 responses and oppositions to the Conduent MTD (ECF. No. 44).

2 WHEREAS, the Verizon MTD and the Conduent MTD each recite they “join” the other, but
3 still remain two separate motions to dismiss that must be responded to (with an opposition and/or
4 response for each) but bear the same due dates for oppositions and responses respectively which
5 periods fully overlap and run concurrently (simultaneously).

6 WHEREAS, because of other litigation of lead counsel for the Plaintiffs, the dual overlapping
7 motions-to-dismiss (one filed by Verizon Defendants and the other filed by Conduent Defendants
8 respectively) filed by the defendants in this Case and a hand injury of lead counsel for the Plaintiffs
9 (limiting certain hand use), the Plaintiffs have requested, and the Verizon Defendants and Conduent
10 Defendants have agreed to, a 35-day extension of time until the end of **Friday, August 5, 2022** to
11 file an opposition (and/or response) to the Verizon MTD (and *all* arguments therein, inclusive of but
12 limited to extending such period until the end of **Friday, August 5, 2022 to file** an opposition to the
13 Verizon Defendants and any parties that joined the Verizon MTD).

14 WHEREAS, the Plaintiffs assert that the proposed requested 35-day extension from July 1,
15 2022 until the end of August 5, 2022 will allow the Plaintiffs to obtain the documents and
16 information necessary to respond to (and oppose) the Verizon MTD and submit (and prepare)
17 necessary filings).

18 WHEREAS, two different motions-to-dismiss were filed (by different defendants) in this
19 Case on June 17, 2022 each respective motion with a due date to respond by July 1, 2022 which
20 means the time for the Plaintiffs to respond to and oppose each such respective motion fully overlaps
21 the other, and whereas each of the two aforesaid motions respectively requires a separate response
22 from the Plaintiffs.

23 WHEREAS, in the June 6th SAO and in the Stipulating Parties’ email communications the
24 Stipulating Parties agreed and stated they “stipulate and agree that to the extent any of the Conduent
25 Defendants or Verizon Defendants, in lieu of filing an answer to the SAC, files a motion pursuant to
26 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12, Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 or any other rule that the time which Plaintiffs would otherwise
27 be afforded to respond to such motion pursuant to Local Rule 7.2, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6 and any other
28 applicable rule shall be extended by an additional 35 days” and whereas the Conduent Defendants

1 and Verizon Defendants state the Conduent MTD and the Verizon MTD are motions to dismiss. See
2 ECF No. 32, ECF No. 42 and ECF No. 44.

3 WHEREAS, in the June 6th SAO and in the Stipulating Parties' email communications the
4 Stipulating Parties agreed and stated, "the Parties further stipulate and agree that to the extent any of
5 the Conduent Defendants or Verizon Defendants files a motion pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12, Fed.
6 R. Civ. P. 56 or any other rule on or before June 17, 2022 that the time which Plaintiffs would
7 otherwise be afforded to respond to such motion pursuant to Local Rule 7.2, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6 and
8 any other applicable rule shall be extended by an additional 35 days", and whereas the Conduent
9 Defendants and Verizon Defendants state the Conduent MTD and the Verizon MTD are motions to
10 dismiss. See ECF No. 32, ECF No. 42 and ECF No. 44.

11 WHEREAS, this stipulation is filed prior to the current July 1, 2022 due dates (deadline) to
12 oppose, and respond to the Verizon MTD (ECF No. 42) and the Conduent MTD (ECF No. 44).

13 WHEREAS, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b) requires the Court to approve an extension of time to file
14 oppositions and responses, and therefore the Plaintiffs, Conduent Defendants, and the Verizon
15 Defendants collectively respectfully request that the Court approve the stipulation, and HEREBY
16 STIPULATE AND AGREE as set forth below:

- 17 a. This is the Stipulating Parties' ***first stipulation*** for an enlargement of time for the Plaintiffs
18 to file an opposition and response to the Verizon MTD (ECF. No. 42)(and to also oppose
19 and respond to any party that joined the Verizon MTD);
- 20 b. The Stipulating Parties stipulate and agree that the deadline for the Plaintiffs to oppose and
21 respond to the Verizon MTD (ECF No. 42) (including opposing the Verizon Defendants
22 and any party who joins the Verizon MTD and any arguments the Verizon MTD has joined)
23 shall be extended to 35-days from July 1, 2022 until the end of **August 5, 2022 such that**
24 **the Plaintiffs shall have until the end of August 5, 2022 to oppose and respond to the**
25 **Verizon MTD;** and

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 c. This stipulation is made in good faith and not made for purposes of delay.
2

3 IT IS SO STIPULATED.
4

5 /s/ *Ikenna Odunze*

6 IKENNA ODUNZE
7 Nevada Bar No. 9885
8 **ODUNZE & SWANIGAN**
9 **ODUNZE PLLC**
10 3651 Lindell Road, Suite D #142
11 Las Vegas, NV 89103
12 Tele: 702.943.0305
13 E-Mail: ipo.odunzeswanigalaw@gmail.com

14 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
15 MICHAEL A. VIDAL and
16 ESTATE OF EVA RAMOS
17 (through its Administrator
18 JESSICA CLEMENTE)

5 /s/ *Kyle J. Hoyt*

6 KYLE J. HOYT
7 Nevada Bar No. 14886
8 **JACKSON LEWIS P.C.**
9 300 S. Fourth St., Suite 900
10 Las Vegas, NV 89101
11 Telephone: 702.9212457.2600
12 E-Mail: Kyle.Hoyt@jacksonlewis.com

13 EDWARD D. PERRIN, JR.
14 (admitted pro hac vice)
15 JENNIFER R. POE
16 (admitted pro hac vice)
17 **HALLETT & PERRIN**
18 1445 Ross Ave., Suite 2400
19 Dallas, TX 15222-3112
20 Tele: 214.914.5150;
21 E-Mail: eperrin@hallettperrin.com

22 Attorneys for Defendants
23 *Conduent Incorporated, Conduent Business*
24 *Services, LLC, Xerox Corporation, and Xerox*
25 *HR Solutions, LLC*

26 /s/ *Daniel B. Heidtke*

27 DANIEL B. HEIDTKE
28 Nevada Bar No. 12975
29 **DUANE MORRIS LLP**
30 100 N. City Parkway, Suite 1560
31 Las Vegas, NV 89106-4617
32 Tele: 702.868.2600; Fax: 702.385.6862
33 E-Mail: dbheidtke@duanemorris.com

34 JAMES P. HOLLIHAN
35 (*pro hac vice motion to be filed*)
36 **DUANE MORRIS LLP**
37 625 Liberty Ave., Suite 1000
38 Pittsburgh, PA 15222-3112
39 Tele: 412.497.1040; Fax: 412.202.4508
40 E-Mail: jphollihan@duanemorris.com

41 *Attorneys for Defendants*
42 *Verizon Pension Plan for Associates; Verizon*
43 *Employee Benefits Committee; Kevin*
44 *Cammarata; Verizon California Inc.; Verizon*

Communications Inc.; Verizon Services Corp.; and Verizon North LLC

IT IS SO ORDERED:

Anne R. Traum
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: June 23, 2022